DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 065 464 SP 005 765

AUTHOR	Schwartz, Henrietta S.
TITLE	An Experiment in Training Teachers for Inner-City Schools: A Social System's Approach in the Ford Training & Placement Program.
INSTITUTION	Chicago Univ., Ill. Graduate School of Education.
PUB DATE	Apr 72
NOTE	31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Assn., Chicago, April 1972
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Inservice Teacher Education; *Preservice Education; *Social Systems; Teacher Education; *Teacher Placement; *Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS	Chicago Board of Education; *Ford Training and Placement Program; University of Chicago

ABSTRACT

The Ford Training and Placement Program, organized by the Department and Graduate School of Education of the University of Chicago in cooperation with the Chicago Board of Education, trains and places new teachers in inner-city schools and retrains the teachers already in those schools. The program features a social system's approach to the training and placement of educational professionals at various grade levels and in various subject areas. Five characteristics of the program include 1) function; 2) content; 3) structure; 4) process; and 5) interaction of function, content, structure, and process. The need to specify program functions concerns the problems to be addressed, the frame of reference with which to view the problems, and the functions to be performed. The content of the program is a four-faceted operation: focused preparation of preservice personnel, co-ordinated preparation (training in common with others who would work in inner-city schools), selection of the induction or target schools, and creation of cadres or teams (university and school based). Structure of the program was viewed in terms of an effective and stable staff. The fourth characteristic stresses a complex process by which the program maintains itself and undergoes revision. The final characteristic is the effective and efficient interaction among the elements in the program. General outcomes indicating the success of the program included the unqualified success of six cadres and a 62 percent return of interns to the inner-city school where they trained. An 18-item bibliography is included. (MJM)

ED 065464

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AN EXPERIMENT IN TRAINING TEACHERS FOR INNER-CITY SCHOOLS: A SOCIAL SYSTEM'S APPROACH IN THE FORD TRAINING AND PLACEMENT PROGRAM

By Henrietta S. Schwartz
Executive Director of the Ford Training
and Placement Program
Assistant Professor
The Graduate School of Education
The University of Chicago

For Presentation at
The American Educational Research Association
1972 Annual Meeting
April 3-7, 1972 The Palmer House, Chicago, Illinois

5P005763

AN EXPERIMENT IN TRAINING TEACHERS FOR INNER-CITY SCHOOLS: A SOCIAL SYSTEM'S APPROACH IN THE FORD TRAINING AND PLACEMENT PROGRAM

Henrietta S. Schwartz
The University of Chicago

The school in American society has a dual function: (1) the transmission of the cultural heritage and, (2) the production of change to keep the society vital.[1] Inherent in the dual purposes are conflicting expectations, for to transmit a cultural heritage, one must revere the past and maintain the status quo. Maintaining the status quo often is antithetical to instituting systemic changes. Consequently, educators tend to choose sides--traditional vs. emergent, old vs. new, classical vs. modern, open vs. structured, and so on. Those who feel it their mission to transmit the cultural heritage tend to resist any and all change with near fanatic fervor; those who opt for change leap from one new idea to the next, discarding each before it has a chance to be fully tested, and either assimilated or rejected naturally by the system. Perhaps this dual mission, this open warfare, this rigidity, and this haphazard flexibility has contributed to the "mindlessness" Silberman[2] found at all levels of American education.

The chaos created by the reaction-to-crisis mentality displayed by some educators and legislators is most visible at the elementary and secondary levels. But teacher education and research

programs housed in universities and colleges have done little to counteract this "mindlessness", and the products of these training programs staff America's public schools. All the wild thrashing about, all the charges and countercharges, all the additional resources have done little to reduce the incongruities evident between the schools, often seen as bastions of the status quo, and the impatient client, the urban community, pressing for immediate change. The dissonance between student and parent, clients and educators is highest in inner-city schools serving minority populations. Every manner of remedy has been tried in the past decade, most unsuccessfully.[3] Some few programs have reduced the dissonance. Why? What combination of unique and common elements did these efforts display?

This paper will examine one of the many issues in the general problem of urban education, the training of educators for inner-city schools.

I. Cultural Concepts in Training Programs

Training programs like other systems of human behavior build cultures which are complex, probalistic, and self regulating.[4] And like cultures, there are aspects of programs which exhibit coherence, pattern, and purpose.

A. Cultural Universals

One can view programs in terms of some commonly accepted anthropological universals. For example: Is there a value system which indicates what ought to be the preferred means, modes, and ends of action for the program?

Is there a cosmology or world view which specifies what is, what, in the view of the program, constitutes reality? Is there a social organization governing individual and group relationships? Is there a technology, a way of implementing the necessary tasks required for program functioning and survival? Is there an economic system regulating the allocation of goods and services? Is there a form of governance or a political system regulating individual and institutional behavior? Is there a language uniquely suited to the culture of the program? Is there an educational system which regularizes the transmission of accumulated knowledge to the neophytes in the group?

Programs can be described in terms of these universals, just as one can describe cultures using these constructs. However, this framework is a static one which may not capture the dynamics of interaction found in urban experimental training programs. The sub-discipline of psychological anthropology offers a set of conceptual tools seemingly better suited to the analysis of systems featuring intentional interventions at the individual and the institutional level. The tools are the concepts of function, content, structure, and process.[5]

B. The Concepts of Function, Content, Structure, and Process

Function is conceived of as the pattern of interconnections between the social structure and the social purposes and intended purposes, and the social and institutional life of the system.

Content is conceived of as the patterns of reality which govern the tenacity and intensity of relationships among individuals in the system. It includes those elements which are actively promoted and those which are a result of circumstance. It includes intended and unintended learnings for all members of the system.

Structure is conceived of as the pattern of formal and informal social organizational elements in any system.

Process is conceived of as the actions and manners by which the system operates to maintain itself and undergo change due to any source, internal or external.

It is my conviction that training programs which have been effective in preparing personnel for inner-city schools display five common characteristics.

First, the function, the patterns of interconnections among the program structure, the various actors, and the purposes of the system are explicit. Effective programs feature a sound theoretical base, an analysis of the problem, and a set of logical assumptions which serve as the guidelines for the direction of energies. The statements of function specify that which is, the cosmology of the programs, and that which ought to be, the values for the programs' cultures.

Second, the content of the programs' formal and informal training experiences to govern or to change relationships are related to the desired outcomes. The programs feature sets of co-ordinated task episodes which can be evaluated and changed to provide an appropriate match between individual

needs and the training inputs necessary to achieve desired outcomes. The statement of content should describe the programs' tasks and operations (the technology), the programs' allocation of resources (the economic system), and the scope and sequence of the training for participants (the educational system).

Third, the effective programs feature a structure of meaningful social and work patterns. In any given program, effective and stable operational staff with a consensus of purpose evolves a set of complementary role relationships consonant with program goals. Program participants develop appropriate procedures for relating to each other and to the institutions involved in the program. The description of the structure reveals the relationships among all elements of the program and reflects its social organization.

Fourth, there is a process, or a series of processes, by which interagency co-operation at all levels of the programs is maintained and undergoes revision. Committee structures, policy-making procedures, and staff activities are established to attend to the dual functions of orderly use of and transmission of the power of the programs. (the political system)

Fifth, in effective programs there is an interaction among function, content, structure, and process which allows

for self-regulation and the diffusion of knowledge gained. The programs have available the time, data, and resources necessary for systematic self-correction in a low visibility setting, and the requisite talent to diffuse the programs' findings. The creativity displayed in self-correction and diffusion activities might represent the participants' aesthetic sense, for what is expressed is that which is meaningful or pleasing to the actors in the programs.

Investigate any functional experimental program designed to train personnel for urban schools and the commonalities are evident, though, like cultures, each program may have unique focal points, themes, purposes, and features. The rest of this discussion will be devoted to the detailed description of one such effort--The Ford Training and Placement Program, a very deliberate effort to bring the Chicago Public Schools and The University of Chicago Department and Graduate School of Education into a collaborative effort around the problems of teacher education. The program trains and places new teachers in inner-city schools, and at the same time retrains the teachers already in those schools.

II. The Ford Training and Placement Program

The Ford Training and Placement Program has been in full operation for four years. The program features a social system's approach to the training and placement of educational professionals at various grade levels and in various subject areas.

The conceptual model underpinning the program is the work of J. W. Getzels.[6] The school is viewed as a social system in which the institution defines the roles and establishes certain expectations for the behavior of the individuals filling the roles. Each individual brings to the role a unique set of personality dispositions and values which may or may not be consonant with the expectations of the institution. Barnard[7] maintains that in order to survive, organizations must have purpose, communication, and the willingness of the participants to support the goals of the organization. Conflict can occur when institutions and individuals have varying purposes, little communication, and conflicting expectations. To reduce conflict to a manageable level, logically individuals should be trained to understand organizational purposes, to communicate ways of achieving those purposes, and to identify and to negotiate conflicting expectations. Given these assumptions, Getzels[8] questioned the effectiveness of the prevailing methods of preparing teachers, counselors, and administrators for positions in urban schools.

If one views the school as a unique social system, the average new teacher is ill-prepared to cope with the problems of an inner-city school with a predominantly black population. The newcomers from the middle or upper-middle class are confronted with students who are products of a different social system than the one they have known, with values different from those they hold. Armed with a teaching degree not tempered with

experience, the neophytes enter a unique situation and confront problems for which they have not been prepared. Often they experience what anthropologists describe as "culture shock".[9]

A second problem for the newcomers is that of understanding how their roles relate to others in the school/community. Universities prepare teachers, counselors, and adminstrators separately, as non-related roles in separate curriculums. Yet, in practice, because the school functions as a social system, these various roles function in complementary relationships to each other. This problem extends to current public school practices for placing personnel in schools. Professionals are placed individually rather than as teams. Some magical process of instant rapport is supposed to occur so these school personnel can form a competent interacting group capable of dealing with the complex problems when in many cases they have never even met each other until the first day of school. Finally, the conception of the school as a social system suggests that for the school to function properly there must be communication and interaction among the trainer (the university), the user (the school), and the client (the community). It was to this complex set of problems that a program for more efficient preparation and placement of personnel for inner-city schools was projected.

The Department and Graduate School of Education of The University of Chicago obtained the co-operation of the Chicago Board of

Education and presented the plan to the Ford Foundation. In January of 1968, the Ford Training and Placement Program was funded for three years. The promise of the program convinced the Ford Foundation to continue its financial support through 1973.

III. The Five Characteristics of Effectiveness Exemplified in the Ford Training and Placement Program.

A. Function

In keeping with the first characteristic of an effective training program, the need to specify functions, The Ford Program* seeks to:

1. Develop professional competence along at least twelve dimensions.

2. Facilitate the induction of beginning professionals into the school/community along eight dimensions.

3. Develop an aura of shared responsibility among training team (cadre) members and other staff members for the educational program of the school. Ten or more specifics are considered in moving toward this goal.

4. Promote closer school/community relationships in six areas.

5. Develop appropriate innovative programs in specific classrooms in the co-operating schools where individual program participants are working.

6. Identify school/community problems and act on them within individual and group competencies.

The Ford Program has made explicit its basic assumptions, the problems to be addressed, the frame of reference with which those problems are viewed, and the functions to be

---

*This is an abbreviated statement of the program goals. A complete statement is found in Wayne Doyle's, "A Summary of Major Impressions," unpublished report (mimeographed), 1971.

performed. This first characteristic is crucial to planning the content of experiences needed to operationalize the model.

B. Content

As originally designed by Getzels,[10] and as subsequently shaped and changed by practical experiences, the content of the program is a four-faceted operation.

The first facet is the Focused Preparation of pre-service personnel wherein various secondary and elementary education students who volunteer for work in inner-city schools receive special preparation to help them cope in this difficult role. Over the years a variety of screening techniques has been devised and programmatic research has evolved a selection model to identify likely candidates. Psychological tests, in-depth interviews, and profiles of background characteristics are used to select participants for the second year of work.

The second facet is Co-ordinated Preparation, the training in common of those who would work in inner-city schools to improve their communication skills and be sure they are all aware of each other's problems.

The third facet is the Selection of the Induction or Target Schools. Each year three inner-city schools are selected with the consent of the principal, the faculty,

and the community for participation in the program. The participation involves the introduction of special methods and materials relevant to the schools' needs. The schools serve as sites for the internship and eventual placement of prospective inner-city school personnel.

The fourth facet is the primary tool of the whole program... the Creation of Cadres. Cadres are teams comprised of two groups, the university-based people and the school-based people. The university-based group includes new intern teachers, and specialist interns, including administrators, adult educators, social workers, and social psychological specialists. The school-based group is made up of those people actually functioning at the selected school, either teaching in the subject matter or grade level represented by the intern teachers or working in the specialist roles represented. In addition, the principal or assistant principal of the school, a school counselor, and any other personnel deemed appropriate to represent the social system of the school are included. Each cadre team also includes one or more community representatives who develop methods by which schools and communities may communicate. These community representatives increase teachers' awareness of the needs and aspirations of the students and their parents, and help identify the problems central to a specific urban school.

One of the focal points of the program's content is

cross-role training. Cross-role training simply stated means that school personnel understand the problems of the community served by the school; that teachers understand what the principal does and what he expects of teachers; that each individual in the system is trained to understand the problems, tasks, and expectations of other roles in the school. Teachers are trained to understand what expectations the school system, colleagues, students, and parents hold regarding their behavior. Conflicting expectations are identified, analyzed, and negotiated in cross-role training sessions.

A completed cadre usually has from 15 to 25 members and begins its own three-year program as follows: During the first year (focused preparation), primary emphasis is placed on graduate development of the individual's professional field, coupled with some training on the problems of inner-city schools. This is a qualification period for the intern teacher, during which volunteers are interviewed and evaluated for work in the program on the basis of qualifications developed by research and practical experience. The second year of an individual's program marks the beginning of co-ordinated preparation for service in a specific inner-city school. Cadres are formed and the first meetings take place during an intensive six-week program the summer preceding the intern year at the school. These sessions include full cadre

membership and are devoted to four specific phases.[11]

The first phase broadens the general knowledge of the participant on learning problems of the students in the specific school at which he will teach. Role competency is stressed.

The second phase introduces new members to the specific community where the school is located, and brings to light the common problems and issues existing in that community.

The third phase consists of sessions where cadre participants and faculty from the university discuss the latest advances in their particular fields and plan appropriate curriculum activities for the beginning of the school year. Micro-teaching clinics using students from the target school involve all cadre members, even the principal.

A fourth phase is comprised of cadre development and extends throughout the year-long internship period and, in successful cadres, beyond the placement year. (The attached chart diagrams the sequence.)

When the school year begins, the cadre enters the school as a group and begins work. Each member carries out his specific function, but with the added responsibility of being a member of the cadre. Cadre members then meet on a weekly basis to discuss mutual problems and plan courses of

action. Once a month, the cadres meet in groups with cadres from other schools at the university. Problems of general concern to all groups are reviewed and special training resources are provided as needed to smooth cadre operation.

Throughout all these activities, cross-role training is practiced to be certain each member maintains a general overview of the whole problem. The cadres build the kind of interpersonal relationships among members that allow them to share resources and support each other personally and professionally. This interaction between new and experienced personnel is crucial when one considers the fact that the university-based interns must become competent classroom teachers before they can hope to do anything else. They need the expertise of the school-based teachers. It does the interns little good to espouse the overhauling of the entire system when they cannot manage their own classes. The teaching intern's first duty must be to demonstrate individual role competence in the classroom. The intern's full-time placement is dependent upon his demonstrating teaching competency to public school administrators, university faculty, and his cadre peers.

The third year of cadre activity is called the placement year, and it involves full-time service for all members and a continuation of cadre activities. The development of positive relationships among cadre members is the product

of the interaction between the program's content and the program's staff structure. Simply putting people into groups does not guarantee locomotion toward program goals. The function and content must be accompanied by an efficient program structure. The staff must co-ordinate the elements in the system.

C. Structure

The third program characteristic, a viable structure represented by an effective and stable staff, seems simple-minded, but inappropriate definition of roles, faulty staff selection, and intermittent training can doom the most promising project. Given the nature of the Ford Program's assumptions, the administrative staff of the program had to have a thorough understanding of, and be able to function in, a private research-oriented university featuring faculty members with highly individualistic interests. The staff had to work with a large bureaucratic urban public school system earmarked by mistrust of the "ivory tower theorists", and a series of impatient hostile school communities uncertain of which changes to demand or how to demand them. The first year and one-half of program operation was spent in defining staff structure and roles, in staff development, and in creating the research and evaluation staff to provide on-going feedback.* Consequently, only one of the first three cadres organized in 1968 was successful. Just creating cadres and placing them in schools

---

*50% of the Ford staff is engaged in research and evaluation.

was not enough. Each group needed additional on-site guidance and training unique to the problems of the school. To meet this need a structure of field staff roles evolved. In addition to university faculty members who serve as curriculum consultants, two staff roles are added to each cadre. It is crucial that persons filling these roles be willing to commit the necessary time in the field, be well-versed in the conceptual model, and be convinced of the worth of the program. The first role is that of the cadre liaison who has direct staff responsibility for providing leadership in helping the cadre identify and move toward its goals, and secure the necessary human and material resources to implement projects at the school. The individual in this difficult and important role must represent staff and cadre, articulate program expectations and activities, serve as the information source for the cadre, and relate to the administration and the community. The liaison must build trust in both cadre team and staff. There is no substitute for the knowledgeable respected liaison person who can orchestrate the individual talents of those who comprise the cadre. The second staff role in each cadre is that of the group process consultant who facilitates the group's understanding of, and dealing with, the problems that impede the group's development. The process consultant helps the group negotiate intergroup and interpersonal conflict, improve communications, develop strategies for working with non-cadre faculty members,

clarify role expectations, etc. The liaison and the process consultant work as a team to guide the cadre's development into a supportive and productive unit.

Cadres share common elements of the program's culture, but each is unique in the kind of structure it develops to fulfill its functions. Each group must solve for itself the problem of leadership. Some groups have let the liaison become the leader; others have established the role of chairman or convener; some have developed rotating leadership tasks. High school cadres tend to work by agenda and subcommittee structures; elementary school groups typically evolve less formal structional and operational patterns. Some cadres make decisions by majority rule, others by consensus, and a few by default rather than by design. Cadres will establish roles and abolish them; expand membership and contract it by removal or resignation. Both staff and cadres change structure to accommodate the dynamics of the power relationships internal and external to each group and transaction. The governance process for the cadre is evolved by the group. The staff has less flexibility in this area.

D. Process

The fourth program characteristic, the process by which the program maintains itself and undergoes revision, is a complex one in the Ford Program. Several agencies are related to, and influenced by, the operations of the program.

Consequently, program staff and policy-makers must consider each agency in the implementation of the program and achieve productive working relationships among the departments of the university, the Chicago Board of Education, the local school communities, the cadres, and, not insignificantly, the Ford Foundation. The governance of the program, its political system, has been devised to promote maximum interagency co-operation. The policy-making executive committee has representatives from university programs and the public schools. Other co-ordinating and operational committees have broad membership to provide a balanced view and a fitting distribution of the program's power. For example, placement of interns requires the working together of several agencies. It is at this point that interagency co-operation becomes vital. For the public schools it means placement and personnel policies must be changed. Traditionally, beginning teachers were placed as <u>individuals</u>. The cadre has a <u>group</u> of interns trained by the university for a specific school; the Board of Education has a commitment to place these interns as a <u>group</u> in the school for which they were trained. In these times of teacher surplus this commitment can cause difficulties, as indicated by Curtis C. Melnick, Associate Superintendent, Area A, Chicago Public Schools.[12]

> "The school system operates under rules and regulations which are established by the school code for the State of Illinois. We have to operate according to the procedures established by the Board of Examiners for the Chicago school

> system. The present Board is very flexible and is attempting to bend its policies to meet the demands of current applicability.
>
> We think that the notion of a cadre is an excellent idea and one that bears promise and fruit for the Chicago school system in a way that no other program has. This is why we are able and willing to climb out on a limb to make it possible not only to aid in the training of the people during their internship year, but also to bend our policies, perhaps even break them, for the placement of these particular people."[13]

A high level of mutual trust and support has characterized the relationships among the institutions in the program. This collaboration has contributed to the expansion of the cadre in the placement year. Often by this time, other members of the faculty have opted to use university resources, and join the cadre, creating what is called an extended cadre.

The cadre is by the placement year a task-oriented group, the problem of individual competence having been taken care of the previous year. There is a change in the staff and governance patterns in the group during the placement year. The university-furnished liaison member is replaced by a cadre member selected by the group. The cadre becomes a self-sustaining entity. Although both the human and material resources of the university are available on request, Ford staff members begin the process of forming new cadres for work in other schools.

E. The Interaction of Function, Content, Structure, and Process

The fifth and last characteristic of a productive program

is the effective and efficient interaction among the elements in the program. The Ford Program displays a clear set of functions, an ethnography of program content, an appropriate program structure, and a set of processes to facilitate self-correction and diffusion. The Ford experiment is fortunate in having had the time, the data, and the resources necessary to self-correct. Early in the program's history a feedback mechanism from research and evaluation findings to staff operations was structured into the decision-making processes. A planning process for refining functions and determining the content of the training experiences was incorporated which permitted inputs from all elements of the system. The view of the program as a culture, as an open system, increases the sensitivity of the staff to events and their impact on the various facets of the program. Research allows the program to present a record[14] which indicates systematic learning from mistakes.

The fact that the program is housed at The University of Chicago mandates an emphasis on research. Fortunately, the experimental nature of the program and the six-year funded time span allowed for trial and error and revision of program operations. By design the Ford Program has over the last three years maintained a "low profile", thus avoiding being caught in the "show and tell" trap inflicted on so many other experimental and demonstration

programs. Three years were needed to work out program content and processes before meeting the commitment to disseminate, demonstrate, and encourage others to replicate the model. The quiet time was spent in translating a conceptual model into a functioning program. Social scientists, historians, teacher trainers, public school personnel, community representatives, and educational researchers on the Ford staff have been engaged in intensive efforts to collect data, analyze them, synthesize and report the results. Now the program is ready to tell others interested in the cadre method of training and placing people what has been learned from this experiment and what questions still need to be asked and investigated.

IV. General Outcomes

Each year, as the program learned from its mistakes, more cadres were successful. Of the twelve cadres involved in the program, six are very successful, three are qualified successes, and three have disbanded. Success is determined by a set of twenty or so measures. For example, in faculty stability, as shown by the retention rate of new teachers, the Ford Training and Placement Program has experienced an unusual 62% return of interns to the inner-city schools where they were trained. This compares to 35% retention nationally, and only 27% in non-Ford inner-city schools in Chicago.

Another measure of success is the carry-over of involvement to other faculty members. Ford cadres have, in some cases,

expanded to include from one-half to two-thirds of total faculties. Another measure is the development of special materials for teaching in these special circumstances. Curriculum materials and projects produced by cadre groups in Social Studies, Black History and Art, English, and Science have attracted national attention. Math materials developed for underachieving students by one of these groups have been so effective, they are receiving city-wide distribution.

Special reading projects involving the parents and teachers working together have resulted in positive, documented student achievements. And finally, there is that most flattering indicator of success, imitation. Plans are under way right now in several universities in four different parts of the country to adopt the cadre approach as a way of training and placing teachers. But a word of caution should be injected. The Ford Training and Placement Program performs no miracles. The program had, particularly in the earlier stages before much was learned about selecting schools and members,[15] three cadres which dissolved after their first year for a variety of reasons: inconsistancies on the part of the program staff, the inability of university interns to relate to the public school staff and community, too much missionary zeal on the part of some interns, too many experimental programs operating in the same building with conflicting objectives, unrealistic goals, racial tensions, a refusal on the part of school-based members to adjust to new work patterns, and inflexible

administrators.

What is most evident in the experience is that the people who make up the cadre are the most important resource of all. A great deal of effort has been devoted to the development of appropriate selection models and training program content. Cadres must have time, expert staff guidance, and appropriate training inputs to develop the structures and processes needed to become the kind of group which will benefit the school and the community and add to the knowledge about teacher preparation for inner-city schools. There is no formula for instant cadres but the program has documented carefully the skills and procedures required for nurturing the growth of such groups. The written culture of the Ford Program details how to achieve the interagency co-operation necessary to operate a cadre program; how to unite the diverse interests of urban public school systems, private universities, and socio/political community interests to the common good of the individual teacher and the local school.[16]

V. Summary

The conceptual framework upon which the program is based provided a descriptive statement to analyze and interpret program functions. The actors, the ethnic minorities, the institutions, and the social agencies involved in the experiment exercised multi-level influences on what evolved as the "program culture". The program was established when integration was the school faculty grouping. Within a

year separatism and racial conflict almost destroyed the program until an accommodation and a functional set of operant values were evolved. The presence of a "practical" project at a research-oriented university caused some internal distress until a set of processes leading to useful exchange mechanisms were developed between the field action-oriented staff and the research-oriented professors. The program structure allowed staff members to negotiate the sometimes conflicting expectations of individuals and institutions and permitted participants to establish the structures unique to the needs of each cadre and school. Recently, the teacher surplus has made group placement of new teachers almost impossible, so the program has shifted the content of its training inputs to retraining experienced teachers and influenced the university to establish new degree programs to assimilate program participants. A language, a technology, a set of beliefs, a power structure, in fact, a life style has developed from the interactions of program participants which has influenced the institutions related to the program.

Part of the research activity is focused on documenting this "program culture". The cadre life, the performance of trainees in the school, the tone of the relationship between individuals as they represent program components could not be captured with traditional instrumentation. To record the themes which are the life of the program, the Ford staff turned to techniques from other disciplines, to non-participant and participant

observation, key informant interviews, ethnographic descriptions, small group and interaction analysis, field note organization skills, and content analysis of logs. Tape recordings, videotaping, slides, categorization of background characteristics, and some personality instruments were used to obtain as complete a picture as possible of what was happening, how, why, to whom, and with what results.

It was indicated earlier that the program has consciously operated with low visibility to avoid the overexposure which can bias any experiment. At this point, we are prepared to say, this is what we have done, we believe our approach works, and we invite others to question our assumptions, our operations, and our findings.

The Ford Training and Placement Program enjoys the characteristics necessary to effective functioning. The flexibility of the creative conceptual model has permitted several functional patterns toward successful cadre development. A training program was developed whereby the content of the experiences enabled a variety of individuals and cadre groups to achieve personal and programmatic goals. The program structure facilitated effective role relationships among staff and participants. A capable staff was supported by the intellectual resources of The University of Chicago and the practical experience of Chicago public school personnel. The co-operation of individual university faculty members, community participants, school building principals and faculty, public

school and Ford Program administrators demonstrated the effectiveness of interagency collaboration in producing a viable training program. Finally, the assurance of multi-year funding, on-going research input, and time allowed the program to self-correct its mistakes and to document the processes used to operationalize the conceptual model.

Above all, the program has produced meaningful changes in teacher education for inner-city personnel without destroying either the individuals or the institutions involved in the experiment. Seemingly, maintaining traditions and instituting changes can be compatible goals for experimental programs which develop transactional cultures.[17] The Ford Training and Placement Program has developed a transactional culture* which has as one of its focal points the goal of co-operative behavior for individuals and institutions. This goal is supported by program norms and mechanisms which cause members to direct their energies to negotiating meaningful exchanges between individuals and institutions, between individuals, and between institutions. The Ford Program's norms promote the recognition of individual and institutional resources and limitations. Conflicts are recognized and dealt with. Experience in the Ford Program indicates that a transactional culture permits a variety of adaptations to individual and group needs. But much remains to be learned about how to

---

*A more detailed discussion of the transactional culture of the Ford Training and Placement Program is available in a paper by James F. McCampbell, "The Transactional Culture of an Experimental Project: The Ford Training and Placement Program," unpublished manuscript (mimeographed), 1972.

create such cultures. The use of conceptual tools from anthropology has helped the Ford Program explain how best to implement its goals of training personnel for inner-city schools. Additional research efforts should be directed toward the investigation of the formation, development, and diffusion of the cultural patterns unique to experimental educational programs.[18] The accumulation of knowledge about patterns in the cultures of effective and ineffective programs could lead to the explanation and eventually the prediction of the arrangement of elements which tend to characterize effective programs. Appropriately applied, such research findings might reduce some of the "mindlessness" displayed in instituting educational innovations.

NOTES

[1]Robert J. Havighurst and Bernice L. Neugarten, Society and Education (3rd ed.; Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1967).

[2]Charles E. Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom; The Remaking of American Education (New York: Random House, 1970).

[3]See for example: Peter Shrag, "Why Our Schools Have Failed," Commentary, XLV:3 (March, 1968), 31-39; James S. Coleman, et al., Equality of Educational Opportunity (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966); G. Alexander Moore, Jr., Realities of the Urban Classroom (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1967); Seven training models are described in The Journal of Research and Development in Education, II:3 (Spring, 1969).

[4]Melville Herskovits, Man and His Works (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1949).

[5]Francis L. K. Hsu, "Structure, Function, Content, and Process," American Anthropologist, LXI:1 (August, 1961), 794-98.

[6]J. W. Getzels, R. F. Campbell, and J. M. Lipham, Educational Administration as a Social Process, Theory, Research, Practice (New York: Harper-Row, 1968).

[7]Chester I. Barnard, The Functions of the Executive (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1938).

[8]J. W. Getzels, "Education for the Inner-City: A Practical Proposal by an Impractical Theorist," School Review, LXXV:3 (Autumn, 1967).

[9]For a description of new teachers' reactions to value conflict and culture shock in inner-city schools, see Estelle Fuchs, Teachers Talk (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1969).

[10]Getzels, "Education for the Inner-City."

[11]For a full description of the content of the summer training program, see James McCampbell, "Training Teams of Teachers for Urban Schools: The Ford Training and Placement Program," unpublished manuscript, Feb., 1972.

[12]The Chicago Public Schools system is divided into three major geographical areas. Area A, of which Mr. Melnick is the

administrator, encompasses the schools on the south side of the city and is also the area in which The University of Chicago is located.

[13]Curtis C. Melnick, "The Chicago Board of Education and the Ford Program," unpublished statement (mimeographed), 1970, 15.

[14]An extensive list of research reports and a two volume history are available from the Director of Research, Wayne J. Doyle, Ford Training and Placement Program, University of Chicago, 5835 South Kimbark, Chicago, Illinois, 60637.

[15]A summary of the findings of research on the selection models appears in: Wayne J. Doyle, "Ford Training and Placement Program: A Summary of Major Impressions," unpublished report (mimeographed), 1971.

[16]Henrietta S. Schwartz, "A Social System's Approach to Training Teachers for Urban Schools: The Ford Training and Placement Program," Education at Chicago, I:2 (Autumn, 1971), 9-15.

[17]J. W. Getzels and E. G. Guba in "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process," The School Review, LXV (Winter, 1957), 423-441, speak of a transactional leadership style in which the individual aims to understand "the limits and resources of both individual and institution within which administrative action may occur (that is from the nomothetic to the idiographic extreme) and an intelligent application of the two as a particular problem may demand." (p. 438) This style has been consciously promoted by the administration of the Ford Program and does characterize the cultural ethos of the program.

[18]Wayne J. Doyle, "The Role of Transactional Evaluation in Program Development," unpublished manuscript (mimeographed), Feb., 1972.

FORD TRAINING & PLACEMENT PROGRAM CALENDAR

CADRE FORMATION AND PLACEMENT